

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JAN 05 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5, 12-16, 20, 27, and 28 were amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

The rejection cited Figure 5 as containing an error; however, it is believed that the rejection reflects a misunderstanding, rather than a real problem. The arrows between element 518 and elements 510 and 512 are intended to point toward elements 510 and 512. The 'get content' process passes control to the content sources, which retrieve the desired contents and place the retrieved contents into a given storage location. Thus, the content source, not the 'get content' process, places the contents into a location where the page can be assembled. When the contents and navigation objects have been created, the 'build page' process then places the contents into the desired format. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be removed.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The examiner has rejected claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite that the content server system is "for providing content to a user". The amendments to claim 12 are believed to remove the cause of rejection.

Therefore the rejection of claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Hutsch *et al.* (US2001/0034771US1), hereinafter Hutsch. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended all independent claims with the amendments falling into two groups. The first group, containing independent claims 1, 12, 14, 16, and 27, is directed to the embodiment in which the uniform resource locator (URL) that is requested is used as an index into a table that identifies the content source for that URL. This recitation is supported in the specification on page 16, lines 1-18. The second group,

containing independent claims 5, 15, 20, and 28, is directed to the embodiment in which the navigation information that is retrieved at the time of the request identifies the pages to which a user can travel from the page identified by the URL. This recitation is supported by the specification on page 17, lines 6-13. These two groups of claims are argued separately.

Group 1

Representative claim 1 reads,

1. (Currently amended) A method in a data processing system for handling a request for content, the method comprising:
 - receiving the request for content, which contains a universal resource locator;
 - identifying a content source from a plurality of content sources using said universal resource locator as an index into a table to form an identified content source;
 - retrieving the content from the identified content source; and
 - applying a template to the content to generate a Web page.

This claim specifically recites that the universal resource locator (URL) for a page is used as an index into a table that identifies the content source for that page. Because the source of the content, but not the content itself, is stored in a table, the content does not have to be created and maintained at a single location, but can be brought in from multiple locations when each page is accessed and then formatted into a consistent presentation. This is distinct from the prior art, in which each page is prepared and maintained at the server or servers that provide the webpage. It is submitted that this recitation is patentable because information can be pulled in from many sources to form the website, then formatted to make it appear that the information comes from a single source. Hutsch does not appear to contain a reference to using a universal resource locator from the request as an index into a table to determine the source of the content for that page. Therefore, it is submitted that this group of claims distinguishes over Hutsch and is allowable.

Group 2

Representative claim 5 recites,

5. (Amended) A method in a data processing system for handling a request, the method comprising:
 - receiving the request, wherein the request contains a universal resource identifier;

obtaining navigation information using the universal resource identifier and a navigation database, said navigation information identifying pages to which a user can travel from a page identified by said universal resource identifier;

retrieving content from a particular content source from a plurality of content sources using the universal resource identifier;

selecting a template from a plurality of templates using the universal resource identifier; and

generating a Web page using the template, the navigation information, and content.

This claim specifically recites that the navigation information that is obtained at the time of the request comes from a navigation database and identifies pages to which the user can travel from the requested page. Unlike other websites at the time of the invention, the navigation information is assembled after the request is received and is retrieved from a separate navigation database, rather than being stored with the page. Retrieving the navigation information from a navigation database at the time of the request makes the process of changing the navigation information easier. When the information changes, the database can be quickly changed, so that the new information is picked up immediately by all requests. This is contrary to the prior art that required changes to be made to each page that contains a transfer to the changed location. It is submitted that this difference is patentable, because it provides more flexibility to the websites and to their maintenance. It is submitted that Hutsch does not appear to contain a reference to using a universal resource locator from the request to retrieve navigation information from a navigation database. Therefore, this group of claims is allowable over Hutsch.

All independent claims now carry one of the two recitations discussed above, so that all claims are now believed to be allowable. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

Furthermore, Hutsch does not teach, suggest, or give any incentive to make the needed changes to reach the presently claimed invention. Absent the examiner pointing out some teaching or incentive to modify Hutsch to include either the use of the URL as an index into a table pointing to the source of the content or the use of a navigation database from which navigation information is retrieved at the time of creating the page, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to modify Hutsch to reach the present

invention when the reference is examined as a whole. Absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive to modify Hutsch in this manner, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through an improper use of hindsight using the applicants' disclosure as a template to make the necessary changes to reach the claimed invention.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over Hutsch and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: Jan 5 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Betty Formby
Reg. No. 36,536
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Agent for Applicants